

Appl. No. 09/998,386
Amdt. dated 06/02/2005
Reply to Office Action of 04/19/2005

REMARKS

In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 4 - 8, 12, 15 - 19, 23 26 - 30, 34 and 37 - 41 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Nielsen. Claims 3, 14, 25 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen in view of DeStefano.

By this amendment new Claim 45 is presented for consideration. For the reasons stated more fully below, Applicants submit that the claims are allowable over the applied references. Hence, reconsideration, allowance and passage to issue are respectfully requested.

As stated in the previous RESPONSE as well as in the SPECIFICATION, links are displayed in a fashion that allows users to identify them as such. For example, a link may be underlined or may be in a different color than the rest of the text within which it is embedded or both. Although links are ordinarily presented in an identifiable fashion, sometimes it may not be very easy for a user to so identify the links. For instance, when the color used to display a link is the same or very close to the background color of a screen on which the Web page is displayed, a user may not be able to identify the link as such.

The present invention allows a user to make links embedded in a Web page clearly recognizable. In accordance with the teachings of the invention, when a user is unable to clearly recognize links embedded in a Web document as such, the user may have the links highlighted.

AUS920010875US1

Appl. No. 09/998,386
Amdt. dated 06/02/2005
Reply to Office Action of 04/19/2005

The invention is set forth in claims of varying scopes of which Claim 1 is illustrative.

1. A method of making links that are not easily identified in a displayed Web document by a user to be clearly recognizable comprising the steps of:
displaying the Web document; and
upon user command, highlighting the links. (Emphasis added.)

The Examiner continues to reject the claims using Nielsen. Applicants respectfully disagree.

As pointed out before, Nielsen purports to provide a scheme to determine whether or not Web pages represented by links embedded in a displayed document are accessible before a user attempts to access the pages. To do so, Nielsen teaches that access to each Web page represented by an embedded link in a displayed Web document is automatically attempted as soon as the page is displayed. If there is no response within a certain period of time after an access has been attempted, then it is assumed that the Web page is inaccessible. Consequently, the appearance of the link is changed to alert the user that the Web page is inaccessible at the present time. The presumption is that an alerted user will not waste time attempting to access the page.

But, Nielsen does not teach, show or suggest **highlighting links that are not easily identifiable in a displayed Web document upon user command**, as claimed.

The Examiner stated that Nielsen discloses this step (i.e., upon user command, highlighting the links) in this passage: "when the user selects a particular text link
AUS920010875US1

Appl. No. 09/998,386
Amdt. dated 06/02/2005
Reply to Office Action of 04/19/2005

anchor with mouse 44, the browsing system responds by attempting to retrieve the page pointed to by the link anchor ... all of the link anchor 202 are shown as underlined text; col. 3, lines 41 - 48" (see first paragraph on page 3 of the Office Action).

Applicants fail to understand how exactly the passage quoted by the Examiner discloses the claimed step. As far as Applicants can understand, the passage merely states that when a link is asserted, an attempt is made to access the Web page referred to by the link. This is generally how one accesses a Web page from an embedded link in a displayed document.

The quoted passage further states that links in a displayed Web document are displayed as underlined text. This is one of the customary manners of displaying embedded links in a document.

Applicants do not see how the teachings in the quoted passage are going to help a user who has problems identifying links that are embedded in a displayed document from regular underlined passages in the document for example. By contrast, the present invention allows a user to issue a command and all the embedded links in the document are highlighted allowing the user to distinguish the links from regular underlined passages in the document.

DeStefano, as stated before, does not teach, show or suggest **highlighting links that are not easily identifiable in the displayed Web document upon user command**, as claimed. Hence, Applicants submit that Claim 1 and its dependent claims should be allowable over the cited references. Independent Claims 12, 23 and 34 and their

AUS920010875US1

Appl. No. 09/998,386
Amdt. dated 06/02/2005
Reply to Office Action of 04/19/2005

respective dependent claims, which all incorporate the above-emboldened-italicized limitations shown in the reproduced Claim 1 above, should be allowable as well. Newly added Claim 35 also includes the above-referenced limitations and should also be allowable.

Therefore, Applicants once more respectfully request reconsideration, allowance and passage to issue of the claims in the application.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Volel Emile
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 39,969
(512) 306-7969

AUS920010875US1

Page 13 of 13